

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the specification to correct informalities and to ensure consistency between the specification and the preliminary amendment filed and entered on June 18, 2001. Claims 2 and 4 have been amended to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been introduced.

The Examiner has acknowledged allowable subject matter in claims 1-4, i.e., claims directed to the addressing method. Claim 5 stands rejected.

Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claim 5 in view of the arguments presented below:

Rejection of Claim 5

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being unpatentable over the publication “One-IP: Techniques for Hosting a Service on a Cluster of Machines” to Damani et al. (Damani).

We believe the Examiner intended to rely on 35 U.S.C. §102 (b), rather than subsection (e) with regards to the Damani article. Thus, we assume the Examiner is rejecting claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b).

The Examiner rejected claim 5 as being anticipated by Damani (office action, pages 2-3, paragraph 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant is not entirely sure where the Damani passages relied by the Examiner can be found. The Damani article goes from pages 1019-1027. On page 2, third paragraph of the office action, applicant has been unable to find the passages “(Page 17, lines 21-24); and (Mapping table requires storage)” in the Damani reference. In fact, Applicant was unable to locate any of the referenced passages attributed to Damani, such as “a1.nxb.com”, “42.81.13.22” or “(Page 18, lines 1-12)”.

Notwithstanding the undetermined sources of the citations, Applicant submits that Damani does not describe or suggest a name and address server having two addressing zones between which an interface caters for address translations where the server situated in the first addressing zone includes a data storage for storing associations between machine names and addresses of the first zone and a data processing module, which is designed to respond to

the receipt from a first address of the first zone, of a request for an address related to the name of a destination machine belonging to the second addressing zone through the transmission to a second address of the first zone of a first packet containing at least the name of destination machine, and to send back to the first address a response, after receipt from the second zone of a second packet containing a third address of the first zone associated in a dynamic manner with a second address of the second zone, providing the third address of the first zone, as recited in claim 5.

Simply put, nowhere in the article does Damani suggest or describe an interface that caters for address translations nor a server situated in the first addressing zone having a data storage module and a data processing module, as recited in claim 5. As the Examiner notes, the Damani reference “teaches about a technique for hosting a service on a cluster of machines using network address translator but fails to teach the method disclosed by applicant. In Applicant invention there are additional level of addressing, which is introduced by the address interface and management unit.” (office action, page 3, paragraph 3).

Specifically, the Examiner appears to equate “a1.nxb.com” to what Damani refers to as “the ghost address” (see Damani, Fig. 3 and page 1023, first column, lines 1-7). And Damani describes that client requests using the ghost address is sent to a “router”, which the Examiner apparently equates to applicant’s data processing module (Fig. 3, page 1023, first column, lines 16-18). Consequently, the Examiner states that Damani’s router sends a packet which contains the ghost address to the dispatcher. Applicant disagrees.

To the contrary, Damani describes that the packet should contain the address of the source (client address). For example, in Fig. 3 of Damani, the dispatcher is shown using the address of the client (what the Examiner refers to as “42.33.96.5”) to hash a corresponding server 2 (referred to as “128.76.28.4”). Also, in Fig. 4 of a second architecture, Damani describes a method where the dispatcher is not being used. Rather, the client address is broadcast to a cluster of servers in the second zone.

Therefore, nothing in Damani describes or suggests “a data processing module designed to respond to the receipt, originating from a first address of the first zone “42.33.96.5”, of a request for provision of an address in relation to the name of a destination machine “a1.nxb.com” belonging to the second addressing zone through the transmission to a

In re Application of: Francois-Arnaud Remael
Application No. 09/868,731
Response to Office Action of November 15, 2004

second address “42.81.13.22” of the first zone of a first packet containing at least the said name of destination machine” (office action, page 2). And Damani certainly is not describing or suggesting that any dynamic association be made between “a second address of the second zone” and “the said third address of the first zone.”

Moreover, Damani describes that the address sent back to the client is the same address that was originated by the client, i.e., the ghost address (“[a]fter processing the request, server S2 replies directly to the client, again using the ghost IP address, without passing through the dispatcher.” (Damani, page 1023, second column, lines 7-10). Therefore, Damani explicitly teaches away from applicant’s claim, which recites that the data processing module is designed to send back to the first address, a response providing the third address of the first zone.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the Damani reference does not anticipate applicant’s claim 5.

Supplementary Action

In the event that it is determined that the another supplementary office action is required to explain the Damani reference more explicitly or give the reasons more fully, even though no further references are cited, Applicant requests that the Office set a new period for reply, pursuant to MPEP §710.06.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that independent claim 5 is allowable. As claims 1-4 have been found allowable, Applicant submits that all pending claims 1-5 are now in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests that all claims be allowed.

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

In re Application of: Francois-Arnaud Remael
Application No. 09/868,731
Response to Office Action of November 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Richard A. Wulff, Reg. No. 42,238
GARDNER CARTON & DOUGLAS LLP
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: February 11, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF NOVEMBER 15, 2004 (along with any documents referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: February 11, 2005



Irina L. Mikitiouk

CH02/ 22367136.1